Appln No. 09/575186
Amdt. Dated: October 26, 2006
Response to Office Action of August 23, 2006   10

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 2 5 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated August 23, 2006.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the graphic information is superimposed with the tags. Basis for this amendment can be found in Figure 1 and the corresponding passages of the description.

Claim 1 has been further amended to explicitly specify "the tag's own location". Basis for this amendment can be found at page 14, lines 21-24 of the description

Corresponding amendments have been made to claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's analysis of the cited prior art documents.

Referring to Johnson, the Examiner alleges that this document teaches "a plurality of tags, each tag containing a dot code identifying the form and a location of that tag on the form".

Firstly, Johnson does not describe a "plurality of tags". Rather, Johnson merely describes a dot coded region 26, which contains all the information relevant to Johnson's form. The dot coded region 26 in Johnson cannot be described as a "plurality of tags", nor does it suggest a plurality of tags.

Secondly, Johnson's coded region 26 does not identify "the tag's own location on the form". Rather, Johnson's coded region 26 identifies the locations, size, type etc. of various input fields in his form. There is no sense in which Johnson's coded region 26 identifies its own location on the form.

Thirdly, Johnson's coded region 26 is not superimposed with graphic information, as now specified in claim 1. Johnson's coded region is positioned in an allotted code space of his form, which is separate from the input fields.

Turning to Sekendur, the Applicant contests the Examiner's analysis of this document as well. Sekendur does describes coded data identifying x,y coordinates on a printed page and Sekendur also sends position data from an optically-imaging pen to a computer system, such that handwriting can be captured in the computer system.

However, fails to describe sending data regarding the form identity to the computer system. Sekendur is unable to do this, because there is no form identity information encoded into his x,y position code. Hence, unlike Sekendur, each package of indicating data receiving by the computer system in the present invention enables the computer system to identify a form identity *and* the position of the sensing device. This was neither taught nor suggested by Sekendur.

In view of these differences between the present invention and the cited prior art, it is submitted that there was not sufficient teaching in the prior art enabling the skilled person to arrive at the present invention. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of obviousness should be withdrawn.

Appln No. 09/575186
Amdt. Dated: October 26, 2006
Response to Office Action of August 23, 2006   11

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

_____
Kia Silverbrook

_____
Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
            393 Darling Street
            Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762